




Docket No.: 204947US6

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

RE: Application Serial No.: 09/810,188
Applicants: Tomoshi HIRAYAMA
Filing Date: March 19, 2001
For: INFORMATION PROCESSING APPARATUS,
INFORMATION PROCESSING METHOD,
INFORMATION PROCESSING SYSTEM AND
RECORDING MEDIUM
Group Art Unit: 2155
Examiner: BRUCKART, B.R.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Our check in the amount of _____ is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle

Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone)
(703) 413-2220 (fax)

DOCKET NO: 204947US6



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF :
TOMOSHI HIRAYAMA : EXAMINER: BRUCKART, B.R.
SERIAL NO: 09/810,188 :
FILED: MARCH 19, 2001 : GROUP ART UNIT: 2155
FOR: INFORMATION PROCESSING :
APPARATUS, INFORMATION
PROCESSING METHOD, INFORMATION
PROCESSING SYSTEM AND
RECORDING MEDIUM

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Restriction Requirement stated in the Official Action dated July 12, 2004, Applicants in the above-identified patent application provisionally elect Group I, Claims 1-13, drawn to a method, apparatus and recording medium for a client server relationship in an information process.

The Restriction Requirement asserts that the application contains claims to distinct inventions. However, MPEP §803 states the following:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

The claims of the present invention would appear to be of an overlapping search area.

Serial No: 09/810,188


Response to Restriction Requirement dated July 12, 2004

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully **traverse** the Restriction Requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner.

However, if the present Restriction Requirement is not withdrawn, examination on the merits of the Claims of Group I is believed to be in order, and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 06/04)

DOCUMENT4